

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/666,521	09/20/2000	Jun Koyama	SEL 209	6933
7590 12/03/2003 Cook Alex McFarron Manzo Cummings & Mehler Ltd			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T	
Suite 2850 200 West Adams Street		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Chicago, IL 60606			2674	15
			DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/666,521	KOYAMA, JUN			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kimnhung Nguyen	2674			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 N	ovember 2003.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the correct of the contract of the correct of the c	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the since a specific reference was included in the first 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language pro 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included in the first sentence of the reference was included.	s have been received. s have been received in Applicative documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). of the certified copies not received priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(ast sentence of the specification of the certified copies application has been received priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120	ion No ed in this National Stage ed. e) (to a provisional application) r in an Application Data Sheet. ceived. and/or 121 since a specific			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2674

DETAILED ACTION

This Application has been examined. The claims 1-36 are pending. The examination results are as following.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14-16, 18-22, 24-26, 28-31 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US patent 6,072,450) in view of Yamazaki et al. (US patent 6,388,652 cited by Application).
- 3. Regarding claims 1, 9, 19 and 28, Yamada et al. disclose in figures 1-4 and 17 that an electronic device comprising an EL display device (1) including a thin film transistor (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4); an EL element (39) with the pixel electrode as a cathode; and an insulating layer for sealing the EL element (see abstract, and see figure 17, column 15, lines 34-45), and a source driver circuit (see figure 20). However, Yamada et al. do not disclose a source driver circuit for applying an analog image signal to the EL element; and a correction circuit for gamma-correcting the analog image signal. Yamazaki et al. disclose in figure 14, an EL display (see column 17, lines 32-35) comprising a source driver circuit (25) for applying as analog signal of RGB to the EL element; and a correction circuit for gamma-correcting the analog image signal (16) correcting means for gamma correcting the analog image signal (18, see figures 14-15,

Art Unit: 2674

column 18, lines 23-30), and therefore, the thin film transistor, the pixel electrode, the EL element, the insulating layer, the applying means and the correcting means are formed over a same substrate (see Yamazaki et al. of figure 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the a source driver circuit for applying as analog signal of RGB to the EL element; and a correction circuit for gamma-correcting the analog image signal correcting means for gamma correcting the analog image signal as taught by Yamazaki et al. into the device system of Yamada et al. because this would for analog signals transmitted from outside are RGB signals having a horizontal and vertical synchronization signals and performing extension of a time axis and are outputted as analog signals (see column 17, lines 55-62).

Regarding claims 1, 10, 20 and 29, Yamada et al. do not disclose a memory for storing data for gamma-correcting. Yamazaki et al. disclose a memory (17) for storing data for gamma-correcting (see figure 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the memory as taught by Yamazaki et al. into the device system of Yamada et al. because this would for performing extension of a time axis and are outputted as analog signals (see VRAM 17, see column 17, lines 59-62).

Regarding claims 3, 12, 22 and 31, Yamada et al. disclose a color filter being formed at position corresponding to the pixel electrode (see column 12, lines 28-49).

Regarding claims 5-6,14-15, 24-25 and 33-34, Yamada et al. do not disclose wherein the gamma-correcting amplifies a signal of red, or gamma-correcting attenuates a signal of blue or

Art Unit: 2674

green. Yamazaki et al. disclose wherein the gamma-correcting amplifies a signal of red and inherent of attenuates a signal of blue or green (see figure 14, column 18, lines 23-31).

Regarding claims 7, 16, 26 and 35, Yamada et al. do not disclose wherein the gamma-correcting is independently applied for each of signals of blue, green and red. Yamazaki et al. disclose the gamma-correcting is independently applied for each of signals of blue, green and red (see figure 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using gamma-correcting is independently applied for each of signals of blue, green and red as taught by Yamazaki et al. into the system of Yamada et al. because this would provide an improvement an EL display having correction values for driving conditions of individual surface of the electron beam.

Regarding claims 11, 18, 21 and 30, Yamada et al. disclose wherein the EL display device is used in an electronic device selected form the group consisting of an EL display.

4. Claims 8, 17, 27 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US patent 6,072,450) and Yamazaki et al. (US patent 6,388,652 cited by Applicant) as applied to claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 above, and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US patent 6,445,005).

Yamada et al. and Yamazaki (6,388,652) disclose every feature of the claimed invention as discussed above, excluding wherein the EL element comprises a luminescent layer comprising a polymer organic material. Yamazaki et al. (6,445,005) disclose an EL layer (45) is formed and made of polymer type organic material (see column 10, lines 37-40). It would have been

Art Unit: 2674

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the an EL layer is formed and made of polymer type organic material as taught by Yamazaki et al. (6,445,005) into the device system of Yamazaki et al. (6,388,652) because this would for providing light of white color to be a light emitting layer (see Yamazaki et al., see column 10, lines 62-63).

5. Claims 4, 13,23 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US patent 6,072,450) and Yamazaki et al. (US patent 6,388,652) as applied to claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 above, and further in view of Choi et al. (US patent 6,583,577).

Yamada et al. and Yamazaki (6,388,652) disclose every feature of the claimed invention as discussed above, excluding wherein the El element comprises a first pixel comprising a blue luminescent layer, a second pixel comprising a green luminescent layer, and a third pixel comprising a red luminescent layer. Choi et al. disclose in figures 2 and 4 an El element comprises a first pixel (B) comprising a blue luminescent layer, a second pixel (G) comprising a green luminescent layer, and a third pixel (R) comprising a red luminescent layer (see first to third EL diodes, see figure 4, see abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the first, second and third pixels comprising blue, green and red by EL diodes as taught by Choi et al. because this would be independently driven without a complicatedly-designed data driving circuit, thereby simplifying the data driving circuit as well as reducing the product cost (see abstract).

Page 6

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number (703) 308-0425.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RICHARD A HJERPE can be reached on (703) 305-4709.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D. C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only).

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Kimnhung Nguyen November 28, 2003

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600